

Message

From: Peterson, Todd [Peterson.Todd@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/29/2020 1:52:35 PM
To: Knott, Steven [Knott.Steven@epa.gov]; Hughes, Hayley [hughes.hayley@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: SACC items to consider

Thanks. As always, there are multiple considerations.

I sent a note to Amparo. Let's see what she provides as a response.

Best Regards,

Todd Peterson, PhD
Designated Federal Official

From: Knott, Steven <Knott.Steven@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 9:43 AM
To: Peterson, Todd <Peterson.Todd@epa.gov>; Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: SACC items to consider

Thanks Todd. Just to clarify, the transcripts cannot serve as the minutes. When I mentioned your proposal during my general yesterday, I described the approach as preparing a set of minutes that includes only the required elements, plus a bulleted list of recommendations. The result would be meeting minutes that run about 20 pages or so and could be produced fairly fast. The reader would be referred to the transcripts for the details.

While I don't think there are any legal impediments to taking this approach, I do think there will be objections from the public and OPPT. A bulleted list is useful for a "minutes" summary and to help with tracking. However, it would lack the substance needed for the level of understanding that is required for implementation.

I think for the upcoming meetings (and longer term), an approach somewhere between the above approach and the current approach (90-100+ page minutes/reports) is needed. Longer term, it may be that we need to revisit the Agency's charge. I think the current charge questions are leading to redundancies in the Committee's responses.

Anyway, just wanted to pass along these additional thoughts.

With respect to uploading the audio files to the docket – I don't have any concerns with this if the docket can accommodate the files. My understanding is that we must make the audio files available to the public (at least on request). Therefore, if the docket can be used as a means of public access, I think that's the most efficient approach.

Thanks again.

Steve

Steven M. Knott, M.S.
Chemist and Executive Secretary
FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel and
Science Advisory Committee on Chemicals
U.S. EPA Office of Science Coordination and Policy
Knott.steven@epa.gov

From: Peterson, Todd <Peterson.Todd@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2020 9:09 AM
To: Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>; Knott, Steven <Knott.Steven@epa.gov>
Subject: SACC items to consider

Hayley and Steve,

Just for context, what I'm sharing here is simply suggestions and a bit of 'thinking out loud.'

First, OPPT obviously needs a list of recommendations for their response to the SACC deliberations on any draft risk evaluation. In recent correspondence with one member of RAD I was given a copy (I forwarded to Steve as well) of one of their response to comments table (which includes SACC and public comments submitted to the docket).

So, the minimal need is a list of recommendations (but to be complete, these are sometimes extracted from the text of the meeting minutes and final report documents, both Endyna (for us) and the OPPT contractor scour the report for additional recommendation language).

OSCP needs to eventually know not only the number of recommendations, but get a number for the recommendations that OPPT intends to accept and work on.

Given the strain of two very close and overlapping meetings, I simply floated the idea that the SACC might focus on the provision of recommendations and that the transcript serves as the meeting minutes. How this might be combined or presented at the docket may draw criticism ... so we can consider options. And this sort of arose from Diana's ideas on summary slides at the meeting for Asbestos. Finally, I agree with Steve, the idea that I floated is at one end of the spectrum and the traditional report is at the other. And I want to add, I do like the reports as we have been producing them, so this is really just a situational suggestion and not to be taken as a forever change—especially with 60 day deadlines for these latter reports.

Second, we talked about the audio files and uploading to the web site. I asked about the uploading to the docket. And actually I need to step back and say we have not really uploaded audio files to the docket as a routine. Only the transcript.

I'll ask the docket staff about size and file type.

I'll leave it up to you two as to whether we want to upload audio files (if the docket says ok) and what we might do if the audio is on the web for a time but not in the docket (we may get comments on that from the public).

I'll forward the response from the docket when I hear back.

Best Regards,

Todd Peterson, PhD
Designated Federal Official

US Environmental Protection Agency
OCSP/OSCP
Scientific Advisory Panel & Science Advisory Committee on Chemicals
William Jefferson Clinton East Bldg
Mail Code M 7201
1200 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20460

Office: 202-564-6428